
**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE MEASURES WORKGROUP
AUGUST 9, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Wednesday, August 9, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Performance Measures Workgroup held its second official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Linda Anisman (Small County Rep – Inyo County)
- ☒ Mica Bennett (FTB Rep)
- ☐ John Braun (DCSS Analyst)
- ☐ Carmen Cody (DCSS Co-Leader)
- ☒ Michael Coleman (DCSS Rep)
- ☐ Sharon Covarrubias (FTB Rep)
- ☐ Marsha Devine (Judicial Council Rep)
- ☐ Lenny Goldberg (Advocates Rep)
- ☐ Leora Gershenzon for Lenny Goldberg
- ☒ Susan Green (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)
- ☐ Deborah Harper (SEIU Rep)
- ☒ Rita Hayes-Thompson (Medium County Rep – Ventura County)
- ☒ Alan Hiromura (CSAC Rep)
- ☒ Joan Neblett (Large County Rep – Los Angeles County)
- ☒ Ken Masuda (CSAC Rep)
- ☐ Sharyn Matsumoto (CSSAS Rep)
- ☒ Liz Mechem (FTB)
- ☒ Nancy Melton (County Analyst – Riverside County)
- ☒ Barb Saunders (OCSE Rep)
- ☒ Melanie Snider (Advocates Rep)
- ☐ Robert McCloud for Melanie Snyder
- ☒ Mark Whitmore (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)
- ☐ Lillie YeeShiroi (CSSAS Rep)
- ☒ Cindy Pocoroba (DCSS)
- ☒ Gay Schimeck

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☐ Mike Kaweck, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☒ Jim Hennessey (SRA Team – PSI)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made at the kickoff sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Susan Green at: sgreen@sdcca.org

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Mark Whitmore opened the meeting with a discussion of the agenda:

- **OCSE to present on the federal performance measures project.**
- **Objective:** To look at the 9 state measures as defined by the legislature and come to agreement on which are similar/identical to the 5 federal measures.

The minutes from the last meeting were confirmed and accepted.

Reiterated that the workgroup as a whole accepted the necessity to adopt the 5 federal measures as requirements.

Jim Hennessey noted the following:

- The group needed to identify issues to bring before the Steering Committee – questions to be answered, etc..
- Any near-term successes should be identified and brought to the Steering Committee – they are looking to provide the legislature with a progress report.
- Needed to identify a group member to record “system requirements” issues – **Liz Mechem** of FTB will take responsibility for this task.

Additional: *Other workgroups*

- **Ken Masuda** reported that the Fair Hearings workgroup asked whether we should measure the “effectiveness of the fair hearing process”. This request was noted and tabled for further discussion.’

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Performance Measures Workgroup Agenda for 2nd Team Meeting – Wednesday, August 9, 2000

Estimated Timeframe	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader(s)
10:00 – 10:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Greetings- Housekeeping Items (Lunch, Restrooms, Phones, etc.)- Confirm Workgroup Roles<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scribe (Mica Bennett?)- Meeting Minutes Recorder (Susan Green?)- Action Items and Ancillary Issues Recorder (Jim Hennessey?)- Contact Point to other Workgroups (Ken Masuda)- Assign new role – Recorder of System Requirements (Identify and collect any discussion points that would be relevant to child support systems requirements - These would then be forwarded to the P3 Team for	Mark Whitmore & Carmen Cody

Estimated Timeframe	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader(s)
	inclusion in a Requirements Database.) - Acceptance of 7/19/00 Meeting Minutes - Review of current Action Items List	
10:15 – 12:00	- Introduction of Gaile Maller - Director of OCSE's Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation - Gaile to give presentation outlining the Federal Performance Measures, the background behind their formulation, and the Federal perspective on our workgroup's task	Barb Saunders Gaile Maller
12:00 – 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 – 12:45	Query OCSE representatives for suggestions regarding the lack of defined DCSS goals and objectives / any other specific questions from the group	Open
12:45 – 1:30	Step through "Current Status" Questions #5, #6 and #7 – get input on these from the OCSE representatives 5. Do any of the agencies mandating collection of the data have performance standards or targets? 6. How is the performance data reported and distributed? 7. Is the data currently being collected believed to be accurate and reliable?	Mark & Carmen <i>Covered in prior meeting – deleted from agenda.</i>
1:30 – 2:00	Step through "Short Term Goals" questions #5 and #6 – get input on these from the OCSE representatives 5. If the data is not considered reliable, what steps need to be taken to test the data for accuracy? 6. What steps need to be taken to ensure that the data is accurate?	Mark & Carmen <i>Covered in prior meeting – deleted from agenda</i>
2:00 – 3:15	Review workgroup members' Performance Measures evaluation exercise responses. Reach group consensus on evaluation of the nine existing State Performance Measures.	Mark & Mica Bennett
3:15 – 3:30	Wrap-Up Activities: - Summarize Accomplishments / Assess Progress - Review newly identified Action Items and assign to workgroup members - Modify / Set Agenda for future meetings	Mark & Carmen

D. DISCUSSION ISSUE: The development of child support performance measures at the federal level.

Gaile Maller, Director of the Division of Planning, and Chief Statistician for OCSE was actively involved in both strategic planning and the development of performance measures at the federal level. The following is from Maller's presentation:

- Was a lengthy process, requiring the coordination of numerous focus groups and workgroups.
- Wanted to focus on program results, not program processes.
- Initially identified 15 measures for consideration – felt that 5 were most representative with respect to the overall goals of the program. These five provided an additional benefit of “leveling the playing field” with respect to making comparisons between states.
- The process required an overhaul of the data reporting – required updated definitions and the elimination of obsolete requirements.

Maller noted that the following **must be present** for performance measures to provide value:

- Measures must be tied to the program goals and objectives outlined in the strategic plan.
- Performance must be tied to incentives and/or penalties.
- Measures must be attainable – when developing the measurement scale, look to see if at least ½ of your population is in the top 50% and ½ in the bottom.
- Must find ways to improve the low performers.

Additional topics presented:

- OCSE currently conducts state data audits – wants to validate the data supporting the 5 measures.
- Discussion of how OCSE set the collection base – rationale for weighing both the TANF and non-TANF collections.
- Phase-in of incentives/penalties.
- Noted that the other performance measures (in addition to the 5) identified in the OCSE 2000-2004 Strategic Plan are for future consideration. No targets have been set.
- Noted that demographics appear to have no correlation with levels of performance. Historical practices are more significant. For example, universal orders, case closure practices, the charging of interest, etc. all play a role in a state’s ranking with respect to performance.
- Indicated that one outcome of setting the federal performance measures is *to drive states to a certain level of uniformity with respect to business practices* – the drivers being those practices which lead to the highest performance scores.

Maller concluded that the lack of a performance-based incentive structure (in California), only reinforces the validity of placing an initial emphasis on the 5 federal measures - to which financial incentives are tied.

Gaile Maller’s e-mail address is gmaller@acf.dhhs.gov Phone: (202) 401-5368

E. Evaluation of the Nine Measures Identified in Legislation.

At this point, the workgroup split into three groups of four, and evaluated the nine State measures. The goal of the exercise was to reach consensus as to which of the nine measures were included in the five federal measures. Keeping in mind that the value of performance measures decreases as the number of measures increases, it was felt that the group should work to narrow the number of measures ultimately recommended. The results of the exercise are included in Table 1.

Table 1.
Review of Nine State Measures

Measure	Subgroup Results	Comments
1. Percent of cases with a court order for current support <i>Percentage of IV-D cases in which there is an order for current child support as of the end of the fiscal year</i>	Consensus from all three subgroups – number's #1 and #4 combined are satisfied by the Federal Measure #2 (see Attachment 1. for federal measures). Conclusion: Recommend deleting this measure and accepting Federal #2 as a substitute.	As noted in group discussion, there appears to be little program value in setting standards and measuring performance based on this measure.
2. Percent of cases with collections of current support <i>Percentage of IV-D cases in which a current support payment was received during the fiscal year.</i>	Consensus of all three subgroups - If defined as \$ collected over \$ owed, all three groups concluded that this is essentially the same as Federal Measure	Need to revisit this measure and provide a clear definition.
3. Average amount collected per case for all cases with collections <i>The average dollar amount of child support collected per paying IV-D case in the fiscal year.</i>	Subgroup Consensus: this measure is not contained within any of the federal measures.	Will require additional discussion to determine whether this measure should be recommended for inclusion.
4. Percent of cases with an order for arrears <i>Measures cases that have an order for arrears</i>	Consensus from all three subgroups – number's #1 and #4 combined are satisfied by the Federal Measure #2 (see Attachment 1. for federal measures). Conclusion: Recommend deleting this measure and accept Federal #2.	No further action.
5. Percent of cases with arrears collections <i>Percentage of IV-D cases owing past due support in which arrearage payments were received</i>	Subgroup consensus: Same as Federal #4.	No further action.

Measure	Subgroup Results	Comments
6. Percent of children for whom paternity has been established during the period <i>The percentage of children in the IV-D caseload for whom paternity was established or acknowledged in the fiscal year compared to the number of children who needed paternity established in the same period</i>	Agreement from two subgroups that this measure is contained within federal measure #1.	Will be discussed at next meeting.
7. Percent of alleged fathers or obligors who were served with a summons and complaint to establish paternity or a support order during the period <i>The percentage of IV-D cases needing service in which a Summons and Complaint were successfully served during the fiscal year.</i>	Subgroup consensus – is not within any federal measure.	As noted in group discussion: as service of the S&C leads to the establishment of an order, and orders are already measured, there appears to be little value in adding and setting standards for service.
8. Percent of cases that had a support order established during the period The percentage of IV-D cases in which a support order was obtained in the fiscal year out of all cases that needed support orders	Consensus of subgroups – this measure is time period driven and not contained in the federal measures.	Will be discussed at next meeting.
9. Total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure <i>A ratio of the costs and benefits of a child support enforcement program</i>	Consensus of subgroups – Same as federal measure #5.	No further action required.

Conclusion: As State measures #1, #4, # 5, and #9 are contained within the 5 federal measures, no additional measures are required. State measures #2 and #7 require further discussion and clarification of the measurement definitions. Measures #3, #6, and #8, are not contained within the federal measures and require additional discussion to conclude on their value for inclusion in the State performance measure structure.

F. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION: No homework assigned. The goal of the next meeting will be to go through remaining measures, clarify definitions, and reach consensus on the their disposition. The inclusion of additional measures will also be discussed.

J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES:
None

K. ATTACHMENTS

Federal Performance Measure Matrix (Attachment 1.)

OCSE Strategic Plan – Fiscal Years 2000-2004